Environmental Technology Verification
Metal Finishing Pilot
Vendor Meeting Summary
May 19-20, 1999, Chicago, IL

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Highlights

The ETV Metal Finishing Pollution Prevention Technologies (ETV-MF) Pilot held vendor meetings on May 19 and 20, 1999, in Chicago, IL. Attendees included the EPA Pilot Manager, members of the ETV-MF Team, 13 of 23 vendors who responded to a Request for Technologies solicitation issued on March 18, 1999, and one metal finishing shop. A list of the attendees is included at the end of the meeting summary. Detailed information on the topics to be presented was distributed to all vendors responding to the solicitation for review prior to the meeting.

Donn Brown (Concurrent Technologies Corporation) opened the meetings by welcoming the vendors and explaining that the purpose of the meeting is to describe the various pilot activities and documents in detail and answer any questions the vendors may have.

Alva Daniels (EPA) presented an overview of the ETV Program including goals, benefits, stakeholder roles, and ETV vision.

Donn Brown presented the ETV-MF Pilot Program organization and management, including the ETV-MF Team consisting of CAI Resources, Inc., CAMP, Inc., Integrated Technologies, Inc., and Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center. Mr. Brown discussed the proposed verification testing project management structure and the ETV-MF Quality Management Plan.

George Cushnie (CAI Resources, Inc.) presented an overview of the verification test process including the technology prioritization process, test plan, and the two verification testing approaches being developed by the ETV-MF Team.

The technology prioritization process involves ranking the order of verification testing by evaluating the technology's ability to address the following criteria: applicability to the focus areas (acid bath maintenance, maintenance of aqueous cleaning solutions, maintenance of electroless nickel baths, and chromate conversion coating solution maintenance); applicability to the Strategic Goals Program core goals; consistency with the National Metal Finishing R&D Plan recommendations; degree of innovation; applicability to a wide range of metal finishing processes; economic benefit; capital intensity; complexity of test protocols; and degree of vendor support.

The two verification testing approaches include the standard ETV approach and a generic approach recommended by some of the ETV-MF Stakeholders. In the standard ETV approach, a single technology is tested in a specific application, while in the generic approach, classes of technologies are tested without linking the specific technology with the vendor.

Peter Gallerani (Integrated Technologies, Inc.) presented an overview of the generic verification protocol and explained its purpose is to serve as a guide for developing the detailed test plan.

George Cushnie presented an overview of the test plan, its purpose, structure and content and who is responsible for initiating, finalizing, reviewing and approving the plan.

Chris Start (Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center) presented the format for the verification statements and reports and their planned dissemination methods.

Karri Jethrow (CAMP, Inc.) presented the vendor, metal finishing shop and ETV-MF Team activities and responsibilities during verification testing.

Donn Brown presented the proposed cost sharing approach and schedule of activities following the vendor meeting. The presentation session concluded with the vendors being asked to submit by June 9, 1999 a letter of interest and a narrative on how their technologies can address the nine prioritization criteria.

Summary of Questions Asked by the Vendors During the Question and Answer Sessions Following Each of the Presentation Topics:

Question: Have you had feedback from vendors that have been involved with the ETV program?

Answer: Some vendors, in other ETV pilots, have experienced an increase in sales due to verification testing of their products.

Question: Can you use pre-existing test data?

Answer: Technology performance data resulting from other test programs can be included as an appendix to the test plan. However, the data cannot substitute for ETV testing data.

Question: Will a technology be considered for participation even if it does not address any of the focus areas?

Answer: Yes, however, each technology will be prioritized for verification testing based on the nine criteria presented during the vendor meeting. Applicability to the focus areas is one of the nine criteria.

Question: Can abstracts submitted after the April 16, 1999 deadline be considered for participation?

Answer: To be considered for the first round of testing, a letter of interest and a narrative on how the technology can address the nine criteria must be submitted by June 9, 1999. All others received after that date will be considered for later rounds of testing.

Question: How long is the testing process?

Answer: No testing has yet begun for the metal finishing program. For other pilots, an approximate average is one year from vendor meeting to final report. Some pilot projects have been completed in 9 months.

Question: How closely will the vendors work with the team?

Answer: The ETV-MF Team will coordinate all verification testing activities and work very closely with the vendors in planning and conducting the verification.

Question: What degree of automation of equipment is required?

Answer: Nothing in addition to what is normal for commercial equipment. ETV-MF personnel will be on site for the duration of the verification test to collect data or will arrange for automated monitoring equipment in special circumstances.

Question: What is the benefit of the ETV-MF Pilot Program when vendors can afford their own verification?

Answer: An important benefit of the ETV program is the independent third-party verification of performance under rigorous EPA quality assurance requirements. The vendor can use this information in his marketing.

Question: What is the approximate cost of verification testing? Small companies may not be able to participate due to the costs.

Answer: Verification testing costs are highly variable based on the complexity of the test protocol and capital investment involved. Such costs may be reduced in many ways. For example, selecting a metal finishing shop teaming arrangement where the technology is already installed eliminates shipping, installation, check-out, and dismantling costs.

The Following Vendors Gave Short Presentations on Their Technologies:

Affiniti Water Technologies, Steve Calderone
BEWT Systems Inc., Norman Volle
Commodore Separation Technologies, Inc., Michael Kiehnau

CH2M HILL Engineered Systems, Glenn Zinkus
Eaton Corporation/HADWACO, Tom Christian/Dave Thomas

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Affiliation
Daniel Bailey	Pure Cycle Environmental Technologies, Inc.
Donn Brown	Concurrent Technologies Corporation (CTC)
Steve Calderone	Affiniti Water Technologies
Tom Christian	Eaton Corporation
Andy Crump	Global Kinetics
George Cushnie	CAI Resources, Inc.
Alva Daniels	US EPA National Risk Management Research Laboratory
Peter Gallerani	Integrated Technologies, Inc
Raymond Graffia	Arbortech Corporation
Dick Heller	Aqualogic, Inc.
Karrie Jethrow	CAMP, Inc.
Michael Kiehnau	Commodore Separation Technologies, Inc.
Claire Lesinski	CTC
Tim Lindsey	Waste Management and Research Center
Doug Petter	Riveer Company
Chris Start	Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center
Sam Tamarkin	Self
Kelly Taylor	The MART Corporation
Dave Thomas	HADWACO
Norman Volle	BEWT Systems Inc.
Kevin Warheit	US Filter
Steve Williams	ICF Kaiser, Inc.

Glenn Zinkus	CH2M HILL Engineered Systems